

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-35 and 38-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11, 13, 41 and 42 are allowed.

Claims 14-35 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Dino Barrett for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview on November 30, 2006. During the interview, the changes as made herein were discussed. The Examiner indicated that these changes should place the case in allowable condition.

The written description has been amended on page 32 to clarify structure that the Examiner alleges to be contradictory. As noted in the second full paragraph on page 32, the blocking assembly 22 is operable through the first actuating assembly 24, however at the same time is operable by movement independently of the first actuating assembly 24. By reason of being movable independently of the first actuating assembly 24, the blocking assembly 22 can be operated through the second actuating assembly 26, as seen for example in Figure 4. In short, while the blocking assembly 22 is operable through the first actuating assembly 24, it is independent of the first actuating assembly 24 in the sense that it can be moved independently of the first actuating assembly 24, as by a separate actuating assembly 26.

In the second full paragraph on page 31 of applicant's detailed description, the first, second and third states, as claimed for the first actuating assembly 24, are clearly described. With the changes as made herein, the alleged problem is overcome.

Accordingly, claim 14 is clearly in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and withdrawal of the rejection based thereon is requested.

Claim 14 has been amended to address an antecedent basis problem.

The Examiner has rejected independent claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 likewise as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner questions how the first actuating assembly can be operably connected to other components “without being secured together, merely by translational movement”, as described on amended page 22 and in claims 34 and 35.

As page 22 is amended, the self-contained module is characterized as being secured to the closure element through fasteners. Through translational movement, the parts on the first actuating assembly 24 and blocking assembly 22 become situated in operative relationship. More specifically, with the self-contained module translated to against the moveable closure element 12 and secured thereto as by fasteners 124, the free end 30 of the push button actuator 28 on the module is situated to be moved in its actuating path. At the same time, the cantilever blade 242 on the cam element 192 on the module situates in a position so that as it is pivoted, it interacts with the plate 146 on the blocking assembly 22. The description on page 22, as amended, states accurately that the first actuating assembly and remainder of the lock system components become operably related without requiring any separate fastener acting between the blocking assembly and the first actuating assembly. The operative relationship is established by relative movement and maintained by securing the module to the closure element, as opposed to requiring direct interconnection of the module and blocking assembly, as through separate fasteners.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 34 and 35 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Only claims 14, 34 and 35 are specifically rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In light of the amendments made herein and the arguments made above, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable, as are the remaining claims, which depend therefrom.

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 14-35 and 38-40 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Dec 7, 2006